



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

if it would keep me out of hell, let alone purgatory? and I saw plain enough there was plenty forby me that considered that. Well, then he came to Mrs. Owens, and if he hadn't the horriest names for her that ever you heard, it's a wonder; and when he got just black in the face with abusing her, it's a fiend out of hell, I was going to call her, says he; and, sure enough, I saw many a poor creature that seemed ashamed to hear Mrs. Owens called that way, for it's she that's good to the poor. Well, then he went on to tell them what to do to the Ranters; and if they would not throw dirty water on them, and gather on them in the street, and hoot them, and sweep up the puddles in their floors in their faces with the besoms, he'd call them on the altar next Sunday, and put the curse of God and his curse on them, and never give them the rights of the church as long as they lived; and so that was Father John's sermon at the blessed altar."

"Well, and what became of it a Monday?" said Jem.

"Why, then, sure enough, I went to see," said Pat; "and what should I see, when the readers came up the street, but up comes Brady, the jammer, with a big hand-bell that Connor, the bell-man, rings in the street when there is an auction; and Brady, the jammer, comes up the street, ringing his bell, and gathering all the blackguards in the street, and sure they are the bad set in Kilcommon, and up he goes to the readers as they were going into a house; and of all the screeching, and cursing, and bad language, and ringing that ever you heard, it beat all."

"And how did the readers take it all?" said Jem.

"Just as pleasant as you please," said Pat; "they had a word to answer for everything, and were never put out, no more than if they were ringing bells themselves all their lives."

"Well, and did the people let them in?" said Jem.

"How durst they," said Pat; "when such a mob was riz on them? But I saw that a deal of them did not like it at all, and went out and listened to the readers and the clergyman quite quiet. But, oh, the jammer: when the clergyman would offer to speak a word to the people, he'd go and ring his bell up at our ear with one hand, and when that was tired with the other hand, at the other ear, screeching himself black in the face; and then the clergyman would say, holding up the Douay Bible in his hand—'Is it your own Bible that you hate, that you treat it that way? Why don't your priest come himself, and show if the book is a bad one?' And, indeed, when the people saw how pleasant and quiet the readers behaved, they thought it bad work, and out comes old Sally Smith, and says she to the jammer, 'Is that what your at, and isn't it yourself that would sell the priest next for a glass of whisky?' And, indeed, I heard after that, that the jammer was hired by Father John, and that he had a pound to put the readers out of Kilcommon, and no cure, no pay. But that's the way it is; and what will come of it, I don't know at all."

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "I'm thinking that if the priest has nothing to say agen the Bible, but dirty water and mud, and shouting, and the ringing of a bell, he'll never put it out of Kilcommon that way. Sure all the boys must see, when they come to think of it, that their religion is in a bad way, when the priest has nothing else to say for it."

"Well, indeed, I'm thinking that's true," said Pat; "but we'll see, and who knows but the readers and the Bible will have Kilcommon yet?"

## POPE PIUS V.—CATECHISM OF COUNCIL OF TRENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have often been surprised that the vast majority of Roman Catholics, believing themselves to possess an infallible guide, do not more generally refer to the original documents, which alone contain, with certainty, its true teaching. It rarely happens that they go beyond the instructions of their particular spiritual guide, whose fallibility they do not, in theory, deny; but whom yet they thus elevate, in practice, into their only infallible standard. It cannot be expected that all priests should be equally well informed, or should take the same views of their church's doctrines, scattered as they are over so many ponderous and difficult volumes. Hence arise the greatest differences amongst individuals, which seem completely to mar the practical utility to be derived from a common authoritative standard. An instance of this occurs to me as a good example, not that it appears to a Protestant to be on a point of any vital importance, but because it is much insisted on by eminent Roman Catholics divines, and yet seems to be a palpable inconsistency.

The 4th and 5th verses of the 20th chapter of Exodus, which form the second commandment in the Protestant version, and which, though very frequently omitted in catechisms, are yet acknowledged by the Roman Catholic Church as part of the first precept, have lately provoked no small controversy. Our translation is objected to as a wilful perversion; and it is argued that we have introduced the words "graven image" improperly, and to uphold our heretical views on that subject. To those who remember that the next word is

"similitude," or "likeness," it would seem of little moment, as this must include an image; but it is not so treated, and if worth a very warm attack, it deserves a just defence. Dr. Dixon, whose name derives unusual importance from his recent elevation to the Roman Catholic Primacy, published a work, some few months since,\* in which he devotes a chapter to the meaning of the two verses, and bases much of his argument on the Protestant mistranslation, or introduction of the word *image*. Dr. Doyle, in his "Abridgement of Christian Doctrine,"† distinctly attributes great weight to this view. The Douay Bible represents the careful opinion of many of the greatest biblical students, and was specially revised by Dr. Murray, and is, therefore, to be taken as the exponent of their opinion on this point, and translates the words in question "*graven thing*."

The only translation usually referred to, as stamped by the Roman Catholic Church with the attribute of infallibility, is the Vulgate, in which the word "*sculptile*" is used, which leaves the controversy open, or rather favours the Douay version. It appears to me, however, that there is another, even (if possible) more authoritative, and certainly more decisive. The Catechism of the Council of Trent has been usually received as the undoubted expression of the church's doctrines, and, if not infallible, has never had its accuracy impeached by Roman Catholic divines. This, too, has been commonly referred to in Latin, and does not, therefore, advance the controversy a step. But, fortunately, I find that there were two editions promulgated simultaneously, both from the Papal press at Rome;‡ both with the same authoritative approval of Pope Pius V., and both in the year 1567. On an inspection of the two, there is no reason to pronounce one of more authority than the other; the one is in Latin, the other in Italian; and, if a preference should be given to either, it should be to that which was in the native language of those who drew it up, and which was, therefore, incapable of error from ambiguity or misunderstanding. Turning, therefore, to the 375th page, we find the commandment thus rendered:—

"Non ti farai alcuna *immagine scolpita*," &c., and farther on, "*non le adorerai, ne le onorerai*."

I need hardly translate words so obvious and unmis-takeable—"Thou shalt not make thee any *sculptured image*." And, again—"Thou shalt not adore them, nor shalt thou honour them." The first needs no comment, and the second expression is no less valuable; for no words are so frequently translated in different forms, and so often disputed, as those that express different kinds of forms of worship. The infallible declaration, therefore, that images are not even to receive a religious honour, seems to me to have been wholly overlooked by Roman Catholic controversialists. As to the introduction of the word "*images*," it suggests this inquiry—Are Dr. Doyle, Dr. Murray, and Dr. Dixon right, and was Pope Pius V. wrong? And, if not, then did not these three learned divines teach incorrectly, on what they said was important? This will surely show that no Roman Catholic should rest satisfied with the mere *ipse dixit* of his priest, however learned, but should refer to the documents which alone he believes infallible.

One word on a feature in this authoritative edition, particularly as it is one that may have tended to cause this very error. The oversight was most natural; for, without a very careful perusal, this text is not likely to be discovered at all. The verses that are given, as constituting the ten commandments, are printed in very large type, quite distinct from the rest of the book, and with a commendable prominence; but this fourth verse, the Protestant second commandment, is omitted in that place and type, though those before and following appear; and any reader would naturally imagine that it did not form any part of the ten commandments. However, some pages afterwards, it is introduced in the commentary, so that it cannot be said it is wholly omitted; but it is so done as not to attract notice, nor to appear a part of the commandment; and not even being placed as a quotation, between inverted commas, it might escape the notice of any reader, who was not previously aware that it was both a verse in the Bible and an integral portion of the decalogue. If this verse escaped the observation of such learned men as the three divines I have named, I may well imagine that I may happen to be the first to now place this important translation before the public.

FONTIUM PETITOR.

## THE TOUCHSTONE.

(Continued from page 104.)

OBJECTION 13.—Protestants commonly teach, that people of all religions may be saved, even Pagans, Jews, or Mahometans, that believe not in Christ, nor receive his Gospel.

Their own Bible, in clear and express terms, condemns this error (St. Mark xvi. 16)—*He that believeth not (the Gospel) shall be damned. Acts iv. 12—Neither is*

*there salvation in any other; for there is no other name (but the name of Jesus) under heaven given unto men, whereby we must be saved. St. John iii. 36—He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.*

REPLY.—It is plain that the persons here spoken of are such as had had the Gospel preached to them; which some of them received, and others, to their condemnation, rejected.

As for such Pagans as have lived and died without ever having heard the Gospel, no Protestant Church presumes to decide how they will be judged; because Scripture gives us no information on the subject.

But that Protestants consider it a matter of great importance to make known the Gospel to Pagan nations is sufficiently proved by the toils, and dangers, and sufferings which many of their missionaries encounter in that work; and in the zeal and liberality shown by others in sending out and supporting such missionaries.

OBJECTION 14.—Protestants teach that it is not necessary to salvation to embrace the faith and communion of the true church.

Their own Bible teaches the contrary, when it tells us (Acts iv. 47) that *God added daily to the church such as should be saved. And (Isaiah lx. 12) that the nation and kingdom that will not serve (the church) shall perish.*

REPLY.—These passages, it should be observed, make no mention whatever of the Church of Rome. Protestants do hold that the Gospel promises are limited to those who are members of the Church of Christ—namely, the universal church—which consists of all believers in Christ throughout the whole world. But they do not admit the supremacy claimed by the Church of Rome and by the Greek Church; each of which calls itself the only "true Church," and the "Catholic Church," and demands submission from all Christians. Let any one try such claims by the Touchstone of Scripture, according to the professed design of this tract. Protestants will admit the claims of the Church of Rome if any passage can be found, either in the Epistle to the Romans or in any other part of Scripture, describing the Church of Rome as supreme over all Christians, and as possessing an authority which all are bound to submit to. A doctrine so very important as this would be, if true, would surely have been mentioned by the Apostles, had they known of any such. But we find them, on the contrary, always speaking of each of the churches—of Ephesus, for instance, and Corinth, and Thessalonica, &c.—as perfectly independent of any one on earth, except the Apostles themselves.

OBJECTION 15.—Protestants look upon it uncharitable to say, that *heresy* is a damnable sin, or that *heretics* are in a state of damnation.

Their own Bible (Gal. v. 20) expressly reckons *heresies* amongst those sins of which it pronounces, that *they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.*

OBJECTION 16.—Protestants are of opinion, that no man shall be damned for following a wrong religion, if he really judges it to be right, whether he have taken sufficient pains to inform himself of the truth or no.

Their own Bible expressly tells them (Prov. xvi. 25), *There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death.*

REPLY to 15, 16.—If you read through the Prayer-book of the Church of England, including the Thirty-nine Articles, you will find no such declaration. And as for what any private individual, Roman Catholic or Protestant, may declare as his own private opinion, this, be it right or wrong, is not to be regarded as a decision of his church.\*

The same observation will apply to the 16th objection. But no Protestants deny what the Apostle says at Gal. v. 19, 20, 21, concerning the sins which are there enumerated, among which, along with heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, and many others, they find *idolatry*—that is, adoration of images.

But Protestants do not, in general, presume to pronounce of any individual sinner that he is inevitably doomed to final perdition, and that it is impossible for the Almighty to pardon him; because God alone can perfectly know what opportunities each man has had, and what temptations he has been exposed to. And no Protestant church has ever put forth any such declaration as that contained in objection 16.

If a passage could be cited, from the works of any individual Protestant writer, declaring it as his belief that it is a matter of indifference whether a man have taken due pains to inform himself of the truth or no, this would prove nothing against any other Protestants. But we do not believe that even any one such passage could be found.

OBJECTION 17.—Protestants, to justify their wide notions of salvation in any religion, falsify the Scripture, by forging a text, nowhere to be found, even in their own Bible—viz., that *a remnant of all shall be saved.*

Their own Bible loudly condemns this forgery (Rev. xxii. 18, 19)—*I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, &c.*

\* A General Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures. Duffy, 1852.  
† R. Coyne, Dublin. 1846. 49.  
‡ Both in Trinity College Library.

\* See Eighteenth Article of Church of England.

REPLY.—This is altogether a mistake. If you read through all the formularies of the Church of England, and of any other Protestant Churches, you will find no such notions taught, nor any such pretended text cited.

OBJECTION 18.—Protestants will have the trial of spirits to be made only by the *written word*, and not by the *living voice* of the pastors of the Church, or by adhering to them or their authority.

Their Bible prescribes a different rule (1 John iv. 6)—*He that knoweth God heareth us* (the pastors of the Church); *he that is not of God heareth not us: by this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error.*

REPLY.—The Apostle John and the other Apostles of the Lord, were divinely inspired, and proved their immediate commission from heaven by the miracles they wrought. Protestants hold themselves bound to hear them, which they do by studying their writings which have come down to us, and comparing with these whatsoever is taught by uninspired men.

You may observe that, in order to condemn Protestants for their procedure, it was found necessary to foist in the words “the *pastors of the church*,” which is not in the Bible.

If any “pastors of the church” teach doctrines at variance with what an Apostle has taught in his writings, it is plain that to follow them is not to “hear the Apostle,” but to be led by the spirit of error.

OBJECTION 19.—Protestants reject *unwritten traditions*.

Their Bible expressly recommends them (2 Thess. ii. 15)—*Brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle.*

REPLY.—Protestants are aware, as, indeed, every one must be, that of things that are reported—i.e., *traditions*—some are true and some false, and some have a mixture of truth and falsehood. The test that they apply is Scripture—the very touchstone recommended in this tract.

Any tradition that is confirmed by Scripture they receive as genuine; any that is at variance with Scripture they reject; and any that is neither confirmed nor contradicted by Scripture, they leave at large, to be believed or rejected by each man according to his own judgment.

As for those who had themselves heard Paul preach, they would be likely, if attentive hearers, to remember correctly what he taught. But those who heard their report of it, and those again who heard the report of these, and so on through fifty or a hundred intermediate reporters, would be likely to depart somewhat from the correct statement of the Apostle's preaching. And, moreover, crafty persons might designedly introduce something into their reports, to serve some purpose of their own; even as the Pharisees, in our Lord's time, had “made the Word of God of no effect through their tradition.”

And it is remarkable that almost the only tradition mentioned in Scripture as having gained currency among Christians, during the life-time of the Apostles, had even then become falsified—John xxi. 23—“Then went out this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die.”

To guard against such danger in future ages, the Apostles committed their doctrines to *writing*; and the Scriptures which they have left us serve as a *touchstone* to try what traditions are to be trusted and what not.

OBJECTION 20.—Protestants take for their rule of faith the *Scripture*, as interpreted by their own *private* judgment.

Their Bible tells them (2 Pet. i. 20) *that no prophecy of the Scripture is of private interpretation.*

REPLY.—The passage here quoted from St. Peter is not inconsistent with the Protestant view of the right of *private* judgment in the interpretation of Scripture. For it relates not to the doctrines, precepts, or histories of Scripture, but to its *prophecies*; and the sense of it seems to be, that a prophecy is not—like a precept or narrative—to be interpreted from the *very words* in which it is written, but is to be explained from the *event* which fulfils it. Thus, the ancient prophecies concerning the death and resurrection of the Christ, were not understood, either by the Jews generally or by the disciples of Jesus, till after their fulfilment; and then we read of his “opening their minds to understand the Scriptures, saying, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to enter into his glory.”

And with respect to the right which the Romish Church arrogates to itself of supreme authority, both in the interpretation of Scripture and on other points, Protestants may feel assured that if St. Peter, as Romanists pretend, had been the supreme ruler on earth of the Christian world, and had appointed that the Bishops of Rome should hold the same rule for ever after, he would not have failed to state it in this his very last epistle, written when he was expecting soon to be removed from this earth, and for the express purpose of reminding his converts of what it was most important for them to remember and observe.

OBJECTION 21.—Protestants maintain that the *Scripture* is clear, and plain to be understood; and that the unlearned run no risk in reading and interpreting it.

Their Bible assures them (2 Pet. iii. 16) that in the

Scripture are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction.

REPLY.—This passage from St. Peter is misquoted. The Apostle is speaking of St. Paul's epistles, in which he says “are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction.” But he does not, on this account, dissuade any of his converts from reading them; he only reminds them that, “seeing they know these things before,” they are to “beware lest, being led away with the error of the wicked, they fall from their own steadfastness.” It was, therefore, some moral fault (self-conceit, and want of humility perhaps) which caused these “unlearned and unstable” persons to wrest the Scripture to their destruction.

(To be continued.)

#### MANNER IN WHICH ROMAN CATHOLIC CONTROVERSIALISTS QUOTE BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR.

IN our September number we had to offer some comment on a letter written to us by “Warner Christian Search” on 2 Maccabees, ch. xii. See page 107.

We had then to observe on the use which “W. C. S.” made of a passage quoted from Bishop Jeremy Taylor. “W. C. S.” gave this passage as Bishop Taylor's own judgment—“This learned doctor . . . THUS EXPRESSES HIMSELF.” We showed that Bishop Taylor had not thus expressed himself, but had only told us what Roman Catholics say for themselves. We showed that he had marked this by the words, “says the Romanist,” which words “W. C. Search” had left out, to make it appear as if Bishop Taylor was giving his own opinion.

Knowing, as we do, that this is not a solitary instance, but a common practice of many Roman Catholic controversialists, to maintain their cause by dishonest quotations from writers of great name and character (as if there was no chance of being able to defend their cause by truth), we then promised to give other instances in which Roman Catholics had dishonestly quoted Bishop Taylor, in order that our readers may see what hope they can have of being guided into truth by such men as seek to defend their cause by the arts of falsehood.

We take our first instance from a discussion, held at Hammersmith, near London, in the year 1839, between Dr. Cumming on one side, and Daniel French, Esq., Barrister-at-law, a Roman Catholic, on the other. We quote from the edition published by Hall & Co., London, 1851.

Mr. French thus introduces his quotation from Bishop Taylor:—

“Listen, also, to that renowned doctor of the Protestant Church, Dr. Jeremy Taylor—a man who, if splendour of genius can atone for the enormous crime of omitting to embrace that truth which shone so vividly in his eyes, will not be destitute of a very large reward in the kingdom of heaven.”—P. 382.

Mr. French concludes his quotation thus:—

“This, I say, is a noble concession made to truth, in a disinterested hour, by Dr. Jeremy Taylor—a man whose perspicacity and wisdom shone so luminously amid the stupor of surrounding error. Oh! such words as these are, indeed, worthy of the mind that uttered them.”—P. 383.

The words should have been truly and fairly stated. But before we give the words, to let our readers judge of this for themselves, we must tell the *purpose* of the words.

The book, called the “Liberty of Prophecy,” was one of the most remarkable books ever published. It was the first book ever published in the world expressly for the purpose of establishing religious liberty. Dr. Jeremy Taylor published this book to persuade mankind that they ought not to persecute men on account of their religious opinions. And there is no denying that it is a great glory and a lawful boast of the Church of England and Ireland, that a bishop of that church (he was a bishop in Ireland) was the first person that ever wrote a book with this noble object. This led him, of course, to consider what religions which are false can have to say for themselves—whether they have such plausible reasons as might deceive well-meaning men, so that we should rather pity than persecute them for being deceived. Where, observe, it is not the *truth* of this doctrine that is in question, but whether those who hold it are to be persecuted or tolerated.

In section 20, he considers the case of Roman Catholics, whether Protestants should persecute or tolerate them. It is from this section that Roman controversialists take all their false quotations from Bishop Taylor in favour of their religion.

The “heading” of the section is as follows:—“How far the religion of the Church of Rome is tolerable”—that is, whether this religion is to be tolerated, or proscribed and persecuted. This in itself would be enough to show any fair man that the subject of the discussion was *not* the truth of this religion.

The commencement of the chapter states this plainly—“Now, concerning the religion of the Church of

Rome, . . . we will proceed another way, and not consider the *truth* or *falsity* of the doctrines; for that is not the best way to determine this question concerning permitting their religion or assemblies. Because that a thing is not true, is not argument sufficient to conclude that he that believes it true is not to be endured.” But he proposes to consider the reasons by which Roman Catholics are “abused” (or deceived), in order to argue from that that though their religion be false, they are yet to be tolerated and not persecuted; and for that purpose he goes on to state what the Roman Catholics say for themselves.

What can we say to the honesty of a man who, after reading this, gives these arguments as Taylor's own proofs or admissions of the truth of their doctrines? Yet this is what Mr. French does, and all other Roman controversialists who quote Bishop Taylor as confirming their doctrines by his own opinions.

Mr. French quotes the passage which immediately follows Bishop Taylor's declaration, that he was *not* considering the truth of Rome's doctrine, and says that this is Bishop Taylor's “concession made to truth!” Is this fair and honest?

But this is not all. It was not enough to *hide* the object with which Bishop Taylor wrote this passage; it was necessary, also, to change and alter the passage in several important particulars, in order that it might seem to bear that sense which Mr. French wished, instead of the sense that Bishop Taylor intended; and Mr. French makes all these changes and alterations without scruple. To show this, we print the passage in parallel columns, as Bishop Taylor wrote it and as Mr. French changed it.

#### MR. FRENCH'S QUOTATION.

“These following considerations may very easily persuade persons of much reason and more piety, to maintain that which they know to have been the religion of their forefathers, which had actual possession and seizure of men's minds and understandings before the opposite professions had a name; as, first, its doctrine having had a long continuance and possession of the church, which, therefore, cannot easily be supposed in the present professors to be a design, since they have received it for so many ages, and it is not likely that all ages should have the same purposes, or that the same doctrines should serve the several ends of divers ages. Secondly—its long prescription, which is such an advantage that it cannot with many arguments be retrenched; as relying upon these grounds, to wit, that truth is more ancient than falsehood, and that God would not, for so many ages, forsake his Church, and leave her in error.

#### BISHOP TAYLOR'S WRITING.

(This is the conclusion, and not the beginning of the passage, as it stands in Bishop Taylor.)

“And here first I consider, that those doctrines that have had long continuance and possession in the church cannot easily be supposed, in the present professors, to be a design, since they have received it from so many ages, and it is not likely that all ages should have the same purposes, or that the same doctrine should serve the several ends of divers ages.

“But, however, long prescription is a prejudice, oftentimes so insupportable, that it cannot, with many arguments, be retrenched, as relying upon these grounds, that truth is more ancient than falsehood, that God would not, for so many ages, forsake his church, and leave her in an error.

(This passage Mr. French cut out, because it showed plainly what Bishop Taylor's meaning was.)

“Again, the beauty and splendour of that church, their solemn service; the stateliness and magnificence of their hierarchy; the name of Catholic, which they claim as their own due and to concern no other sect of Christianity; the antiquity of their doctrine; the continual succession of their bishops; their immediate derivation from

“But this consideration is to be enlarged upon all those particulars, which, as they are apt to abuse the persons of the men, and amuse their understandings, so they are instruments of their *excuse*; and by making their errors to be invincible, and their opinions, though false, yet not criminal, make it also to be an effect of reason and charity, to permit the men a liberty of their conscience, and let them answer to God for themselves, and their own opinions; such as are the beauty and splendour of their church; their pompous service; the stateliness and solemnity of the hierarchy; their name of ‘Catholic,’ which they suppose their own due, and to concern no other sect of Christians; the antiquity of many of their doctrines; the continual succession of their bishops; their immediate